



FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20463

**CERTIFIED MAIL**  
**RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED**

Dan Backer  
Counsel, Stop Hillary PAC  
203 South Union, Suite 300  
Alexandria, VA 22314

**JUN 29 2017**

RE: MURs 6962 and 6982

Dear Mr. Backer:

On June 21, 2017, the Federal Election Commission reviewed the allegations in your complaint dated September 3, 2015, and found that on the basis of the information provided in your complaint and the responses received, there is no reason to believe that Project Veritas, James O'Keefe, and Hillary Rodham Clinton violated the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended ("the Act"). The Commission further voted to dismiss the allegations that Hillary for America and Jose Villarreal in his official capacity as treasurer, Project Veritas Action Fund, Molly Barker, Laura Loomer, and an Unknown Respondent violated the Act. Accordingly, the Commission closed its file in this matter.

Documents related to the case will be placed on the public record within 30 days. *See* Statement of Policy Regarding Disclosure of Closed Enforcement and Other Matters, 81 Fed. Reg. 50,702 (Aug. 2, 2016). The Factual and Legal Analysis, which more fully explains the Commission's decision, is enclosed for your information.

The Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended, allows a complainant to seek judicial review of the Commission's dismissal of this action. *See* 52 U.S.C. § 30109(a)(8).

Sincerely,

Lisa J. Stevenson  
Acting General Counsel

By: Lynn Y. Tran  
Assistant General Counsel

Enclosure:  
Factual and Legal Analysis

# FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION

## FACTUAL AND LEGAL ANALYSIS

RESPONDENTS: Hillary for America and MURs 6962 & 6982  
Jose Villarreal in his official capacity as treasurer  
Hillary Rodham Clinton  
Molly Barker  
Project Veritas  
Project Veritas Action Fund  
James O'Keefe  
Laura Loomer  
Unknown Respondent

### I. INTRODUCTION

The Complaints relate to a Project Veritas Action Fund's<sup>1</sup> ("PVA") employee's purchase of campaign merchandise at a Hillary Clinton campaign rally with funds allegedly provided by a Canadian citizen. The Complaint in MUR 6962 alleges that Hillary Clinton, her authorized campaign committee, and the campaign's Director of Marketing, Molly Barker, violated the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended (the "Act"), and Commission regulations by soliciting and receiving a contribution from a foreign national through a conduit donor. The Complaint in MUR 6982 alleges that PVA and its President James O'Keefe violated the Act by assisting in the making of a contribution from a foreign national and by acting as a conduit for the foreign national contribution to the Committee.

<sup>1</sup> Project Veritas is a 501(c)(3) entity with the self-described purpose to "[i]nvestigate and expose corruption, dishonesty, self-dealing, waste, fraud, and other misconduct in both public and private institutions." *See About, PROJECT VERITAS*, <http://projectveritas.com/about/> (last visited Jan. 17, 2017). The Complaint in 6982 only alleges violations of the Act by Project Veritas, O'Keefe, and Loomer. In its Response, Project Veritas argued, among other things, that it was improperly named as a Respondent, and Project Veritas Action Fund ("PVA"), a separate 501(c)(4) entity, should be substituted. *Project Veritas Resp.* at 1-2 (Dec. 3, 2015). PVA was then provided notice and an opportunity to respond to the Complaint. Although the entities are related, based on their representations and a full review of the available facts, it appears that PVA, not Project Veritas, is the entity involved in the activity at issue.

1 Based on the available information, the Commission finds no reason to believe Hillary  
2 Clinton, James O’Keefe, or Project Veritas violated the Act and exercises its prosecutorial  
3 discretion to dismiss the allegations against the remaining Respondents.

## 4 II. FACTUAL BACKGROUND

5 On April 12, 2015, Hillary Clinton declared her candidacy for President. Clinton  
6 designated Hillary for America as her authorized campaign committee and Jose Villarreal as its  
7 treasurer (“the Committee”). On June 13, 2015, Clinton held a campaign launch rally on  
8 Roosevelt Island in New York City. At the rally, the Committee had a booth where attendees  
9 could make campaign contributions by purchasing Hillary Clinton merchandise including hats,  
10 shirts, pins, and stickers. The booth was manned by employees of Clinton’s authorized  
11 campaign committee, Hillary for America, including Compliance Manager Erin Tibe and  
12 Director of Marketing Molly Barker.

13 The basis of the two complaints is a YouTube video posted by PVA showing discussions  
14 between the Clinton campaign employees, a PVA employee, Laura Loomer,<sup>2</sup> and a self-  
15 identified Canadian citizen regarding whether foreign nationals were permitted to purchase  
16 campaign merchandise.<sup>3</sup> The identity of the Canadian donor is unknown.

17 The relevant events in the video began as Loomer stood in line to purchase Hillary  
18 Clinton merchandise and met an individual who identified herself as a Canadian national  
19 residing in Montreal.<sup>4</sup> As the two approached the front of the line, the Canadian national

<sup>2</sup> Project Veritas Action Fund Resp. (MUR 6982) at 1 (Nov. 9, 2016). Loomer was initially noticed as an unknown respondent, but was identified in PVA’s Response.

<sup>3</sup> Complaint at note 3, citing Project Veritas Action, *HIDDEN CAM: Hillary's National Marketing Director Illegally Accepting Foreign Contribution*, YOUTUBE (Sept. 1, 2015), <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qxF7Z2N7Y4> [hereinafter *Video*].

<sup>4</sup> *Video*, *supra* note 3. Although the video is narrated by O’Keefe, this summary of events is based on the actions and statements depicted in the video and not on O’Keefe’s narration.

1 identified herself as such to Barker.<sup>5</sup> Barker summoned another Committee staffer, identified in  
2 the video as Tibe, who stated that the Committee could not accept a donation from the Canadian  
3 national unless she had a U.S. Passport or Green Card.<sup>6</sup> Loomer then encouraged the Committee  
4 to accept the donation from the Canadian national, stating, "She drove all the way from Canada  
5 to support Hillary, you could give her, she's paying cash."<sup>7</sup> Tibe apologized and explained it  
6 was not the Committee's prohibition, but instead Commission rules that prohibit foreign  
7 contributions.<sup>8</sup>

8 The Canadian national next asked whether she could give the money to Loomer and have  
9 Loomer make the contribution for her.<sup>9</sup> Barker responded, "She [Loomer] could make a  
10 donation."<sup>10</sup> The Canadian national then asked Loomer, "Can you buy it for me?" Loomer  
11 agreed, responding, "Sure, I'll buy it."<sup>11</sup> It is not clear from the video whether Barker heard this  
12 exchange. Loomer then asked Barker, "So Canadians can't buy them, but Americans can buy it  
13 for them?"<sup>12</sup> Barker responded, "Not technically, you would just be making the donation."<sup>13</sup> At  
14 that point it appears, although the order of events is unclear from the video, that Loomer received  
15 money from the Canadian national, made the donation to the Committee in her own name in  
16 exchange for Committee merchandise, and gave some of the merchandise to the Canadian

---

<sup>5</sup> *Id.*

<sup>6</sup> *Id.*

<sup>7</sup> *Id.*

<sup>8</sup> *Id.*

<sup>9</sup> *Id.*

<sup>10</sup> *Id.*

<sup>11</sup> *Id.*

<sup>12</sup> *Id.*

<sup>13</sup> *Id.*

1 national. The total contribution from Loomer was \$75, with \$35 or \$45 coming from the  
2 Canadian national.<sup>14</sup>

3 The Complaint in MUR 6962 alleges that the Committee and Barker violated the Act and  
4 Commission regulations by accepting a contribution from a known foreign national. The  
5 Committee argues that Barker made a good faith effort to comply with the law and resisted  
6 multiple requests to accept a contribution from the Canadian national, asserting that Barker was  
7 unaware of the exchange of money between Loomer and the Canadian national and therefore she  
8 could not have knowingly violated the Act.<sup>15</sup>

9 The Complaint in MUR 6982 alleges that PVA and Loomer violated the Act by soliciting  
10 or providing substantial assistance to a foreign national in the making of a contribution to the  
11 Committee from an individual she knew was a foreign national and by making a contribution in  
12 the name of another. With respect to Loomer's assistance to the Canadian national, PVA argues  
13 that it is not clear that the individual is a foreign national.<sup>16</sup> PVA further argues that "no action  
14 should be taken" as to the alleged violation of the prohibition against making a contribution in  
15 the name of another because the total contribution was less than \$200 and therefore did not have  
16 to be reported by the Committee.<sup>17</sup> Finally, PVA argues that any violations on its part are *de*  
17 *minimis* and should be dismissed.<sup>18</sup> Neither Complaint alleges that Clinton or O'Keefe had any  
18 direct involvement with or personal knowledge of the transaction in question.

---

<sup>14</sup> *Id.*; Hillary for America Resp. at 1 (Nov. 5, 2015); Project Veritas Resp. at 2 (Dec. 2, 2015); Project Veritas Action Fund Resp. at 3.

<sup>15</sup> Hillary for America Resp. at 2-3.

<sup>16</sup> *Id.* at 3.

<sup>17</sup> Project Veritas Action Fund Resp. at 3.

<sup>18</sup> *Id.*

1    **III.    LEGAL ANALYSIS**

2            The Act and Commission regulations prohibit a foreign national from making a  
3    contribution—directly or indirectly through any other person—in connection with an election to  
4    any political office.<sup>19</sup> A “foreign national” is an individual who is not a citizen of the United  
5    States or a national of the United States and who is not lawfully admitted for permanent  
6    residence.<sup>20</sup> A contribution is defined as “any gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of  
7    money or anything of value made by any person for the purpose of influencing any election for  
8    Federal office.”<sup>21</sup> Purchasing campaign merchandise from a committee qualifies as a  
9    contribution.<sup>22</sup>

10           Similarly, individuals are prohibited from knowingly soliciting, accepting, or receiving a  
11    contribution from a foreign national.<sup>23</sup> “Knowingly” is defined in the regulations, and includes  
12    having actual knowledge, being aware of facts that would lead a reasonable person to conclude  
13    that there is a substantial probability that the funds are from a foreign national, or being aware of  
14    facts that would lead a reasonable person to inquire whether the funds came from a foreign  
15    national.<sup>24</sup>

---

<sup>19</sup>        52 U.S.C. § 30121(a)(1)(A), (B); 11 C.F.R. § 110.20(b), (c).

<sup>20</sup>        52 U.S.C. § 30121(b).

<sup>21</sup>        *Id.* § 30101(8)(A).

<sup>22</sup>        *See, e.g., Citizens' Guide*, FED. ELECTION COMM'N, <http://www.fec.gov/pages/brochures/citizens.shtml>  
(last visited Oct. 11, 2016) (“[I]f you pay \$15 for a T-shirt sold by a campaign, your contribution amounts to \$15....”).

<sup>23</sup>        11 C.F.R. § 110.20(g). It is also a violation of Commission regulations to “knowingly provide substantial assistance in the solicitation, making, acceptance, or receipt of” a foreign national contribution. *Id.* § 110.20(h).

<sup>24</sup>        *Id.* § 110.20(a)(4).

1 The Act and Commission regulations also prohibit making and knowingly accepting  
2 contributions in the name of another person.<sup>25</sup> It is a violation of Commission regulations to  
3 “[k]nowingly help or assist any person in making a contribution in the name of another.”<sup>26</sup>

4 Based on a review of the footage, it appears that Loomer violated the Act by knowingly  
5 providing substantial assistance to a foreign national in making a contribution. Loomer knew the  
6 Canadian was a foreign national based on their interactions depicted in the video.<sup>27</sup> Loomer also  
7 knew, based on the conversation with Tibe, that the Committee was prohibited from accepting  
8 contributions from foreign nationals. Despite this knowledge, it appears Loomer accepted  
9 money from the Canadian national and used it to purchase campaign merchandise.<sup>28</sup> But for  
10 Loomer’s assistance, the Canadian national could not have made a contribution to the  
11 Committee.

12 The same analysis supports finding reason to believe that Loomer violated the Act by  
13 serving as the conduit for the Canadian national’s contribution. By assisting the Canadian  
14 national in the making of a contribution in the name of another person, it appears Loomer  
15 violated the Act. There is no minimum threshold for a violation of the conduit-donor  
16 prohibition.<sup>29</sup>

---

<sup>25</sup> 52 U.S.C. § 30122; 11 C.F.R. § 110.4(b)(i), (iv).

<sup>26</sup> 11 C.F.R. § 110.4(b)(iii).

<sup>27</sup> PVA argues that it cannot be certain the individual was actually a foreign national, however, neither it nor the Committee dispute that the individual presented herself as a Canadian citizen.

<sup>28</sup> Although it alludes to the transaction, the video does not show Loomer and the Canadian national exchange money, leaving open the possibility that Loomer used her own money to make the contribution and gifted the merchandise to the Canadian. The Responses, however, concede that Loomer took money from the Canadian.

<sup>29</sup> See 11 C.F.R. § 110.4.

1 Barker and the Committee may also have violated the Act by accepting a foreign national  
2 contribution because, based on the facts available to them, a reasonable person might have  
3 inquired as to the source of the funds Loomer used to make a contribution. Although it is not  
4 clear from the video which portions, if any, of the conversation between Loomer and the  
5 Canadian national she overheard, Barker's statements and actions suggest she may have been  
6 aware of sufficient facts to satisfy the "knowingly" standard.<sup>30</sup> Specifically, Barker was told the  
7 Canadian national did not have a U.S. Passport or Green Card, she asked Tibe whether the  
8 Committee could accept a contribution from the Canadian national, and she was asked by  
9 Loomer whether an American could make a contribution on behalf of a foreign national.  
10 Moreover, the conversation between Loomer and the Canadian national arranging the transfer of  
11 money took place in close proximity to Barker. Based on these facts and circumstances, Barker  
12 and the Committee may have violated the prohibition against knowingly accepting foreign  
13 national contributions.

14 Again, the same analysis suggests that Barker and the Committee may have violated the  
15 Act by accepting a contribution in the name of another. Although it is unclear what, if anything,  
16 Barker overheard, it is possible that she accepted the contribution from Loomer with knowledge  
17 that at least a portion of it originated from the Canadian national. This would be a violation of  
18 the Act.

19 Finally, although not specifically discussed in either Complaint, it appears from the video  
20 that the Canadian national violated the Act by indirectly making a contribution to the Committee.  
21 Taking the individual at her word that she is a Canadian citizen, she violated the prohibition on

---

<sup>30</sup> The Committee specifically denies that Barker had any knowledge that the purchase was partially funded by the Canadian national. Hillary for America Resp. at 3.



1 foreign national contributions by making the contribution to the Committee by giving money to  
2 Loomer to purchase campaign merchandise on her behalf.

#### 3 IV. CONCLUSION

4 There is no information available to suggest Clinton or O'Keefe were in any way  
5 involved with or aware of the transaction giving rise to these matters. Accordingly, the  
6 Commission finds no reason to believe that Clinton or O'Keefe violated the Act. Additionally,  
7 based on its representations that it is not the proper respondent in this matter and a full review of  
8 the available information, the Commission finds no reason to believe that Project Veritas  
9 violated the Act.

10 The available information indicates that the remaining Respondents violated or may have  
11 violated the Act's prohibition against making and accepting foreign national contributions and  
12 making and receiving contributions in the name of another. Nevertheless, the facts in these  
13 matters support dismissing the Complaints as a matter of prosecutorial discretion because the  
14 potential amount in violation is very small. Based on these circumstances, the Commission  
15 exercises its prosecutorial discretion and dismisses the allegations that the remaining  
16 Respondents violated the Act.<sup>31</sup>

---

<sup>31</sup> See *Heckler v. Chaney*, 470 U.S. 821 (1985).